

**Remarks**

Claims 1-17 are pending. Claims 1-17 are rejected by the Examiner.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 8-10, 12-13 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Lahey et al. (US Patent No. 6,587,217).

Lahey is directed at managing print files associated with a job ticket describing a plurality of print files included in a print job. Specifically, Lahey is directed at organizing files in a library in a network printing system using a print server. When space usage in the library has exceeded a predetermined limit, print files are migrated from the library to a backup unit. For each file migrated from the first storage device to the second storage device, a stub file is generated which includes information on the migrated file. When the print job including the selected print file is submitted for printing, the print file is transmitted from the library to the printer.

In contrast, applicants claim a client for a generic document processing device and method. Claim 1 states, in part, a method comprising communicating a location of a document data file and any auxiliary information to a predetermined document processing device, thereby activating a document processing job to be executed in accordance with any operational settings selected by a user.

Lahey involves special print submit software (InfoPrint Submit software) running on a client computer, the special print software translates a job ticket created in a Graphical User Interface (GUI) on the client computer into a format compatible with a special print server (InfoPrint MPC server). The client then transmits the translated job ticket, and other items, to the special print server over a network. The special print server uses the information in the translated job ticket to process the transmitted items and generate printer files based on the transmitted items. Finally, the special print server then selects an appropriate printer to print the print job and transmits the printer files to the selected printer for printing. Communicating

a location of a document data file and any auxiliary information to a predetermined document processing device is not the same thing as a special print server selecting an appropriate printer to print a print job and transmitting the printer files to the selected printer for printing.

It is therefore submitted that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Claim 9 includes similar limitations to claim 1, and applicants therefore submit claim 9 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art for the same reasons. Therefore allowance of claims 1 and 9 is requested.

Claims 2, 5 and 8 depend from claim 1. Since dependent claims necessarily contain the limitations of claims from which they depend, applicants submit claims 2, 5 and 8 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons stated for claim 1. Therefore allowance of claims 2, 5 and 8 is requested.

Claim 17 was rejected on the grounds that Lahey asserts a document processing device is one of the group comprising: a printer, a fax machine, a multi-function peripheral, an electronic document management system, a plotter, a network fax machine, a language translation server and a knowledge management system.

Even if this assertion is true, claim 17 would be patentably distinguishable over the prior art for the reasons set forth below with respect to independent claim 12 and its dependent claims. Namely, claim 12 includes at least one document-processing device, operable to receive a location of a document data file and auxiliary information associated with each document data file from the document-processing client. As stated above, Lahey involves a special print server that selects an appropriate printer to print a print job and transmits printer files to the selected printer for printing. Communicating a location of a document data file and any auxiliary information to a predetermined document processing device is not the same thing as a special print server selecting an appropriate printer to print a print job and transmitting the printer files to the selected printer for printing. Therefore

applicants submit claim 17 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claim 10 depends from claim 9. Since dependent claims necessarily contain the limitations of claims from which they depend, applicants submit claim 10 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons stated for claim 9 and allowance of this claim is requested.

Claim 12 includes a network document printing system, comprising, in part, at least one document-processing device, operable to receive a location of a document data file and auxiliary information associated with each document data file from the document-processing client.

Again, Lahey involves a special print server that selects an appropriate printer to print a print job and transmits printer files to the selected printer for printing. Communicating a location of a document data file and any auxiliary information to a predetermined document processing device is not the same thing as a special print server selecting an appropriate printer to print a print job and transmitting the printer files to the selected printer for printing.

It is therefore submitted that claim 12 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Claims 13 and 15-17 depend from claim 12. Since dependent claims necessarily contain the limitations of claims from which they depend, applicants submit claims 13 and 15-17 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons stated for claim 12. Therefore allowance of claims 12, 13, and 15-17 is requested.

Claims 3, 4 and 7 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lahey in view of Yokoyama (US Patent No. 6,166,826).

Lahey does not disclose every feature of the claimed invention as claimed in claim 1, as discussed above. Yokoyama deals with manipulating files stored in a printer storage. For example, Yokoyama asserts it enables a user to check image data of files stored in the

printing apparatus, whereby erroneous printing can be prevented. Also, Yokoyama states that it enables a user to check the contents of stored files and which can compress data transferred to check the file contents for shortening the data transfer time. Additionally, but along the same very specific printer storage access lines, Yokoyama asserts it enables a user to easily check the contents of stores files in a printing apparatus, method and system.

The combination of Lahey and accessing printer storages to check for files, etc., do not show all elements of claim 1. That is, communicating a location of a document data file and any auxiliary information to a predetermined document processing device, thereby activating a document processing job to be executed in accordance with any operational settings selected by a user, is not remotely similar to a special print server selecting an appropriate printer to print a print job and transmitting the printer files to the selected printer for printing. On the contrary, the stored files in Yokoyama are in storage on the printer. Therefore it would not make sense to communicate the location of a document data file to a printer if the location was on the printer.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1. Since dependent claims necessarily contain the limitations of claims from which they depend, and all elements of claim 1 are not shown even in combination of Lahey and Yokoyama, it is therefore submitted that claims 3 and 4 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested. Claim 7 is allowable on the same grounds as claims 3 and 4, namely, that for the arguments shown above, Lahey and Yokoyama, even in combination, do not show all elements of claim 1, from which claim 7 depends. Allowance of claim 7 is therefore requested.

Claims 6, 11, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lahey in view of Shima (U.S. Patent No. 6,552, 816).

Lahey does not disclose every feature of the claimed invention as claimed in claims 6, 11 or 14, as discussed above. Shima deals with a printing system with one or plural host

computers for generating job data of a print job and a printer for receiving job data. Also, Shima deals with host computers that inform a print server of the location of job data when a print job is generated, the print server temporarily storing the informed location of job data and informing a printer of the location.

The combination of Lahey and Shima do not show all the elements of claims 6, 11 or 14. That is, communicating a location of a document data file and any auxiliary information to a predetermined document processing device and thereby activating a document processing job to be executed in accordance with any operational settings selected by a user, is different from a special print server selecting an appropriate printer to print a print job and transmitting the printer files to the selected printer for printing in combination with either a printing system with one or plural host computers for generating job data of a print job and a printer for receiving job data or host computers that inform a print server of the location of job data when a print job is generated, the print server temporarily storing the informed location of job data and informing a printer of the location.

Since the combination of Lahey and Shima do not show all the elements of claims 6, 11 or 14, it is therefore submitted that claims 6, 11 and 14 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested. Allowance of these claims is therefore requested.

**Conclusion**

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

**Customer No. 20575**

Respectfully submitted,  
MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

*Julie L. Reed*

Julie L. Reed  
Reg. No. 35,349

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.  
1030 SW Morrison Street  
Portland, OR 97205  
(503) 222-3613

I hereby certify that this correspondence  
is being transmitted to the U.S. Patent and  
Trademark Office via facsimile number  
(703) 872-9306, on September 29, 2004.

Signature

*Judy Wigmore*  
Judy Wigmore